UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,043	07/25/2001	Douglas Croeni	10007374-1	7399

7590 08/13/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
PAULA, CESAR B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/916,043	CROENI, DOUGLAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *7/25/04* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 July 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *7/25/01* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application, and IDS filed on 7/25/2001.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claim 1, 11, and 19 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7/25/2001 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 7/25/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 4, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 4 recites the limitation "repeating substep (b.1) and substep (b.2)" in line5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There are no previous "substep (b.1) and substep (b.2)" in this claim or base claims it depends on.

8. Claim 10 recites the limitation "repeating substep (b.1) and substep (b.2)" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There are no previous "substep (b.1) and substep (b.2)" in this claim or base claims it depends on.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seeger et al, hereinafter Seeger (Pat.# 6,640,010 B2, 10/28/03, filed on 11/12/1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, Seeger discloses an OCR engine for defining bounding boxes—bounding shapes-- around each word in a selected document region (col.4, line 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 10-11).

Furthermore, Seeger teaches placing or defining a bounding box is around that word in the document. Once each word has been OCRed, the information for the bounding boxes is

placed in a text file—*situating a first and subsequent words in subsequent valid locations within a page* -- (col.4, line 50-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 10-11). Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *a bounding shape sets out an area invalid for additional word placement*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have set out the bounding box as an area invalid for additional word placement, because Seeger teaches above the enhancement of usability and productivity of text selection (col. 3, lines 47-53). This would provide the benefit of keeping words from overlapping each other, thereby rendering the OCRed text unreadable, and unusable.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Seeger discloses an OCR engine for defining bounding boxes—bounding shapes-- around each word in a selected document region (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 11). In this situation, after a bounding box is placed around a word, the next word is detected along with a space which is placed between the words, and which would be varied as indicated by a user.

11. Claims 3-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seeger et al, hereinafter Seeger (Pat.#6,640,010 B2, 10/28/03, filed on 11/12/1999), in view of Ueda (Pat.# 5,634,094, 5/27/1997).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Seeger discloses displaying results from the OCR procedure, using formatting information for each word (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 11). In this situation, the formatting information is used for displaying or

replicating the OCR results, where the formatting information is retrieved and used for displaying each word in their appropriate coordinates or location on the document—*checking a first location on the page for placement of the first word.* Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *checking a next location until the first valid location is found for placement of the first word.* However, Ueda teaches accommodating a word, wrapping around of that word, when it doesn't fit, because it exceeds right margin of the document (col.4, lines 3-21, fig.4A-B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Seeger, and Ueda, because Ueda teaches above the formatting a document by eliminating misaligned edges on the right margin of a document. This would provide the benefit of providing visually pleasing effect on the document.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Seeger discloses displaying results from the OCR procedure, using formatting information for each word (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 11). In this situation, the formatting information is used for displaying or replicating the OCR results, where the formatting information is retrieved and used for displaying each word (until processing of all the words is exhausted) in their appropriate coordinates or location on the document—*checking a next location on the page for placement of the first word.* Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *when the next location is invalid for text, checking a next location until a valid location is found for placement of the subsequent word repeating substep b2 for additional subsequent words until there are no more subsequent words to place.* However, Ueda teaches accommodating a word, wrapping around of that word, when it doesn't fit, because it exceeds right margin of the document (col.4, lines 3-21, fig.4A-B). It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Seeger, and Ueda, because Ueda teaches above the formatting a document by eliminating misaligned edges on the right margin of a document. This would provide the benefit of providing visually pleasing effect on the document.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Seeger discloses displaying results from the OCR procedure, using formatting information for each word (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 11). In this situation, the formatting information is used for displaying or replicating the OCR results, as word images, where the formatting information is retrieved and used for displaying each word (until processing of all the words is exhausted) in their appropriate coordinates or location on the document. Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *marking an area invalid for text, and reformatting the text by repeating steps b and c, the area marked invalid being defined by a bounding shape for the image.* However, Ueda teaches accommodating a word, wrapping around of that word, when it doesn't fit , because it exceeds or is not within margins of the document area marked by the margins (col.4, lines 3-21, fig.4A-B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Seeger, and Ueda, because Ueda teaches above the formatting a document by eliminating misaligned edges on the right margin of a document. This would provide the benefit of providing visually pleasing effect on the document.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Seeger discloses displaying results from the OCR procedure, using formatting information for each word (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5,

line 12, fig. 4-5, 11). In this situation, the formatting information is used for displaying or replicating the OCR results, where the formatting information is retrieved and used for displaying each word (until processing of all the words is exhausted) in their appropriate coordinates or location on the document. Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *processing text code that indicates which locations within the page are available for text placement.* However, Ueda teaches accommodating a word, wrapping around of that word, when it doesn't fit in allowed margins-- *text code that indicates which locations within the page are available for text placement*-- because it exceeds right margin of the document (col.4, lines 3-21, fig.4A-B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Seeger, and Ueda, because Ueda teaches above the formatting a document by eliminating misaligned edges on the right margin of a document. This would provide the benefit of providing visually pleasing effect on the document.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 6, Seeger discloses displaying results from the OCR procedure, using formatting information for each word's bounding box (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 11).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 6, Seeger discloses displaying results from the OCR procedure, using formatting information for each word (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 11). In this situation, the formatting information is used for displaying or replicating the OCR results, where the formatting information is retrieved and used for displaying each word (until processing of all the words is exhausted) in their appropriate

coordinates or location on the document. Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *text code that allows marking of areas within a page as being invalid for text placement.* However, Ueda teaches accommodating a word, wrapping around of that word, when it goes outside allowed margins, because it exceeds right margin of the document (col.3, lines 20-33, col.4, lines 3-21, fig.4A-B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Seeger, and Ueda, because Ueda teaches above the formatting a document by eliminating misaligned edges on the right margin of a document. This would provide the benefit of providing visually pleasing effect on the document.

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 6, Seeger discloses displaying results from the OCR procedure, using formatting information for each word (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 11). In this situation, the formatting information is used for displaying or replicating the OCR results, where the formatting information is retrieved and used for displaying each word (until processing of all the words is exhausted) in their appropriate coordinates or location on the document. Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *text code that allows marking of an area within a shape* (page area) *as being invalid for text placement.* However, Ueda teaches accommodating a word, wrapping around of that word, when it goes outside allowed an area as marked by the margins, because it exceeds right margin of the document (col.3, lines 20-33, col.4, lines 3-21, fig.4A-B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Seeger, and Ueda, because Ueda teaches above the formatting a document by eliminating misaligned edges on the right

margin of a document. This would provide the benefit of providing visually pleasing effect on the document.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 1, Seeger discloses displaying results from the OCR procedure, using formatting information for each word (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 11). In this situation, the formatting information is used for displaying or replicating the OCR results, where the formatting information is retrieved and used for displaying each word in their appropriate coordinates(the words located one after another) or location on the document—*checking a next location on the page for placement of a subsequent word.* Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *when the next location is invalid for text, checking a next location until a valid location is found for placement of the subsequent word repeating substep b2 for additional subsequent words until there are no more subsequent words to place.* However, Ueda teaches accommodating a word, wrapping around of that word, when it doesn't fit, because it exceeds right margin of the document (col.4, lines 3-21, fig.4A-B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Seeger, and Ueda, because Ueda teaches above the formatting a document by eliminating misaligned edges on the right margin of a document. This would provide the benefit of providing visually pleasing effect on the document.

Regarding independent claim 11, Seeger discloses an OCR engine for defining bounding boxes—bounding shapes-- around each word in a selected document region (col.4, line 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 10-11).

Moreover, Seeger discloses displaying results from the OCR procedure, using formatting information for each word (col.4, lines 11-18, 63-col.5, line 12, fig. 4-5, 11). In this situation, the formatting information is used for displaying or replicating the OCR results, where the formatting information is retrieved and used for displaying each word (until processing of all the words is exhausted) in their appropriate coordinates or location on the document—*checking a next location for placement of a word.* Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *a bounding shape sets out an area invalid for additional word placement.* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have set out the bounding box as an area invalid for additional word placement, because Seeger teaches above the enhancement of usability and productivity of text selection (col. 3, lines 47-53). This would provide the benefit of keeping words from overlapping each other, thereby rendering the OCRed text unreadable, and unusable.

Moreover, Seeger fails to explicitly disclose: *when the next location is invalid for text, checking a next location until a valid location is found for placement of the subsequent word repeating step b and step c for subsequent words until there are no more words to place.* However, Ueda teaches accommodating a word, wrapping around of that word, when it doesn't fit, because it exceeds right margin of the document (col.4, lines 3-21, fig.4A-B). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Seeger, and Ueda, because Ueda teaches above the formatting a document by eliminating misaligned edges on the right margin of a document. This would provide the benefit of providing visually pleasing effect on the document.

Claims 12-18 are directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claims 2, and 5-10 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 19-20 are directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable medium for storing the steps found in claims 11, and 6 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Carau (Pat. # 6,539,117), and Burrows (Pat. # 6,016,493).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5543**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (703) 308-5465. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306,** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CESAR B PAULA
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

8/9/04